

## Individual Review Form

**Proposal number: 2001-I202-2**

**Short Proposal Title: Estuary Action Challenge**

**Explain connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution:**

None

**1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?**

Hypothesis states “.. effective environmental education leads directly to active involvement with ...projects, increased appreciation... and increased understanding...” It is not clear if this active involvement is during or after the environmental education experience. Looking through the full proposal, it appears that this involvement applies only to the project itself. My comments are, of course the students will be involved during the project. My question is: what is the long term effect on these students (change in behavior) as a result of participation in this project? Will they continue to be involved in restoration projects and will they continue to practice safe bay food consumption?

Objectives are clearly stated.

1. Adopt, cleanup and restore urban creek habitats - appears to be during the project only. No measurement of continued involvement after experiences with the project.
2. Increased public awareness
3. Increased public awareness and using safe practices
4. Increase number of teachers using local habitats as ed. resources.

**1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?**

Education programs of project are clearly described - includes work with both teachers and students. Programs are directly tied to objectives.

**1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?**

Approach is well designed as far as it goes. Programs are used in kindergarten to fifth grade. Though not specified, I assume each program is adjusted to grade level. If a student participates in these programs from kindergarten to fifth grade, there should be a long term impact and a permanent change in behavior. However, this project does not measure this.

**1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?**

Yes. Schools involved in the project are in the East Bay. Selected urban streams feed into the Bay.

**1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?**

Yes and no.

Yes, students and families have increased knowledge as a result of participating in these activities. Whether they act on this knowledge; use it to change their behavior is unknown.

No, criteria used in hypothesis testing is numbers of students, teachers and parents directly participating in habitat conservation programs. In this case, numbers don't tell us much except short term behavior. What about long term behavior change?

**2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?**

Monitoring and assessment occurs during the environmental education experience - only measures short term changes. There is no long term assessment of the project - do these students and their families continue to be involved in similar habitat improvement activities and has there been a permanent behavior change as a result of involvement in this project?

**2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?**

Data collection is described for each objective. Evaluations used to make improvements.

**3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?**

Yes, project has been in operation for 8 years and it sounds like it has been successful to this point.

**4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?**

The team appears to be adequately qualified. The Executive Director has BS in freshwater and estuarine ecology and is certified to teach. Education Director has a BA in education and limited classroom experience (3 years). Community Director has no degree, is not certified to teach but has 5 years experience with environmental education.

**Miscellaneous comments**

This is a great project as far as it goes. However, it has been in existence for 8 years. To receive continued support, I suggest that this group do a study of the long-term impact of this program. Is there a lasting effect on the students, parents and community?

**Overall Evaluation  
Summary Rating**

**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating:**

<b>X</b>	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Goal of project is excellent-provides support to teachers after initial training to ensure continued use of materials and curriculum; stream restoration is accomplished; community knowledge is increased.</li><li>- Long term assessment is needed. Does involvement in this project have a long term impact on the students and their families; temporary or permanent change in behaviors.</li><li>- Program should become more self sufficient and reduce overhead costs.</li></ul>
	<b>Very Good</b>	
	Good	
	Fair	
	Poor	